arXiv:1412.3849v2 [math.PR] 20 Dec 2015



# On convergence rate for Erlang–Sevastyanov type models with infinitely many servers

A. Yu. Veretennikov*†

December 22, 2015

**Abstract**

Polynomial convergence rate to stationarity is shown for extended Erlang – Sevastyanov's model.

## 1 Introduction

Consider a service system or process, with countably many servers and one incoming flow of "events" or customers "of the same type" such that the incoming flow has *intensity* $\lambda(x)$, which *depends* on the number $n$ of the customers in the system, and some variables $(x^0, x^1, \dots, x^n) \in R^{n+1}$; we will use notation $x = (n, x^0, x^1, \dots, x^n)$, where $n \in Z_+$. Then, a bit non-rigorously, the existence of intensity $\lambda(x)$ means that

$$P(\text{one new customer arrives on } (t, t+\Delta) \mid X_t) = \lambda(X_t)\Delta + o(\Delta),$$

as $\Delta \downarrow 0$; note that for *continuous* intensities this definition is strict. Here $X_t = (n_t; X_t^0; X_t^1, \dots, X_t^n)$ where each $X^i$, $1 \le i \le k$, stands for the elapsed service time of the corresponding customer, while $X^0$ signifies the time from the most recent *arrival*. This makes sense mainly for states where $n_t = 0$; however, for simplicity of presentation we keep the same notations for all states; just for $n \ge 1$, $X^0$ must coincide with one of the other $X^i$ values. Every customer with the elapsed time of service $X^i$ is served by the corresponding server also with some intensity $h(X^i)$;

*School of Mathematics, University of Leeds, UK & Higher School of Economics, Moscow & Institute for Information Transmission Problems, Moscow, Russia

†The work was supported by the RFBR grant 14-01-00319-A. Also the author is sincerely grateful to G. A. Zverkina for useful advice and help.

respectively, the vector $(X_t^1, \cdots, X_t^n)$ consists of all such elapsed times of all different customers currently present in the system; the meaning of $X_t^0$ was explained earlier.

In such a state space the process $X_t$ is definitely Markov; however, for discontinuous intensities $\lambda(\cdot)$ a justification of existence of the process is needed, which issue will be discussed in the sequel, with a reference to [4] and [21].

The problem addressed in this paper is convergence rate to the stationary regime under appropriate conditions. Recently such convergence rate was studied for the case where $\lambda$ may only depend on $k$ but not on other continuous variables. Here we address a significantly more general case. The price for this generality is that the explicit formulae due to Fortet and Sevastyanov for the stationary distribution are not available any more (but, of course, modelling is available).

Recall for completeness that Erlang's formulae for the stationary regime in the case of exponentially distributed service time (the system $M|M|\infty$) are known since the article [5],

$$p_k = p_0 \frac{\lambda^k}{\mu^k}, \quad p_0 = 1 - \frac{\lambda}{\mu}. \tag{1}$$

where $\mu^{-1}$ is the expectation of the service time, under the assumption of convergence of the series $(\sum_k p_k)$, i.e., $\lambda < \mu$. This was extended under appropriate assumptions (see, e.g., [9, Ch.4, §4-5]) to the case where $\lambda = \lambda_k$ may depend on $k$ only,

$$p_k = P(k \text{ customers in the system}) = p_0 \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \lambda_i}{\mu^k}, \quad p_0 = \left( \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \lambda_i}{\mu^k} \right)^{-1}, \tag{2}$$

and to some more general situation where *intensity* $\mu$ may also depend on $k$ (in which case $\mu^k$ in (2) should be replaced by $\prod_{i=1}^{k} \mu_i$). Similar formulae also hold true for finitely many servers in the system under the condition that the customers arriving while all servers are busy become lost by the system.

Fortet [6] gave the density of a stationary distribution for a general – *non-exponential* – service time distribution with $g(x) = G'(x)$ where $G$ is the distribution function of service time with $\mu^{-1} := \int_0^\infty t \, dG(t) \equiv \int_0^\infty (1 - G(t)) \, dt$:

$$p(k; x) = p(k; x^1, \ldots, x^n) = p_0 \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \lambda_i (1 - G(x^i)), \tag{3}$$

where $p_0$ is given by the same formula as in (2). Sevastyanov [14] extended this result to the case without assuming existence of densities $g$ (for finitely many servers) and for the first time has proved *convergence in total variation* of the non-stationary system to its stationary regime using his version of the ergodic theorem for Markov processes. Further, there were several extensions of this result to the case of infinitely many servers [12, 11, 16, 18]. In all these cases (with a constant $\mu$) starting from [6], the explicit formula (2) holds true.

In [20] a polynomial rate of convergence of the system of the latter type with finitely or infinitely many servers has been established; earlier in [10] exponential rate was found under stronger than in [20] assumptions.

Note that there are also general results about exponential or polynomial convergence for Markov processes and for *regeneration* processes to stationarity under the assumption of appropriate exponential or polynomial recurrence along with a "local mixing" or regeneration [1, 2, 7, 8, 13, 17], et al. So far, none of these general results cover directly the particular Erlang–Sevastyanov type systems and their convergence rates and especially the setting with a "more general" dependence of $\lambda(\cdot)$ of the "whole state" of the process. In any case, the setting under consideration in this paper is not covered by earlier results, including those from [20]. On the other hand, close results for single–server systems were recently studied in [19] and [21] and some ideas from the latter two articles will be used in the sequel. For simplicity of presentation, we study only intensities of service $h(t)$ (see below) only depending on the elapsed time $t$ of this service. However, the point is that a much more general dependence of $h(\cdot)$ on all other coordinates of the process is possible and the result follows practically from the same calculus without changes; this will be addressed in a further work (or, indeed, in further versions of this preprint).

The paper consists of three sections: Introduction; Main result; Proof of main result.

# 2 Erlang – Sevastyanov type system: main result

Let us introduce the state space $\mathcal{S}$: it is a union of countably many subsets,

$$\mathcal{S}_0 = R_+;\ \mathcal{S}_1 = R_+^2; \quad \ldots;\ \mathcal{S}_n = R_+^{n+1}; \quad \ldots$$

To any $\mathcal{S}_n$ with $n \geq 0$ there correspond $n+1$ non–negative coordinates $(x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ and $x^0$, which signify, respectively, the elapsed times of service of all existing $n$ customers $(x^1, \ldots, x^n)$ and the time from the last arrival $(x^0)$, including for $n = 0$. It is convenient to assume that a newly arrived customer with number $n+1$ gets a coordinate $x^k = 0$ with any $k = 1, \ldots, n+1$ with equal probabilities. For state $x = (n, x^0, \ldots)$, denote $n(x) := n$. To establish convergence rate, we will use a characteristic of the service time distribution called intensity of service,

$$h(t) := \frac{g(t)}{1 - G(t)}, \quad t \geq 0, \quad g(t) = G'(t).$$

If the intensity function is constant, it means an exponential distribution of the service time. Denote

$$L_{m,a}(x) := \left( \sum_{j=1}^{n(x)} (1 + x^j)^m \right)^a, \quad \Lambda := \sup_{x \in \mathcal{S}} (\lambda(x)/(n(x) \vee 1)).$$

Note that the function $L_{m,a}$ does not depend on $x^0$ and that it is symmetric with respect to $(x^1, \dots, x^n)$ (recall that for $n > 0$, the value $x^0$ actually equals one of other values $x^i$, $1 \le i \le n$).

**Theorem 1** *Let there exist $C_0 > 0$, $m > 1$, $a > 1$ and $\ell > 0$ such that*

$$h(t) \ge \frac{C_0}{1+t}, \quad t \ge 0, \tag{4}$$

$$\inf_y \lambda_0(y) > 0, \qquad \Lambda < \infty, \tag{5}$$

*and*

$$C_0 > \left(a + \frac{\ell+1}{m}\right)\left(m + \Lambda 2^{a+\frac{\ell+1}{m}}\right). \tag{6}$$

*Then for any $0 < k < \ell$ there exists $C > 0$ such that for every $X_0 = x \in \mathcal{S}$ and $t \ge 0$,*

$$\|\mu_t^x - \mu\|_{TV} \le C\,\frac{L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x)}{(1+t)^{k+1}}, \tag{7}$$

*where $\mu_t^x$ is the distribution of $X_t$ with the initial value $x$, $\mu$ is the unique stationary measure of the process, and $\|\cdot\|_{TV}$ is the total variation distance.*

**Remark 1**. The condition (6) used here is a bit more precise than in [20] and it fits some further possible generalizations. For any particular value of $k > 0$, the bound (7) with *some* $m$ and $a$ is valid for any $C_0$ large enough. The details will be given in a further work. Note that the strong Markov property follows for our system similarly to [4]; the full details will be also provided in further publications. Uniqueness of stationary distribution is one of the statements of the Theorem. It is likely that the assumption (5) on $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ may be considerably relaxed; this is also the subject for a further work.

**Remark 2**. Important news is that the constant $C$ in (7) is not just finite but admits an effective estimate. Of course, in the earlier versions including [20] similar constants in the main estimate – e.g., in the inequality () in [20] – also admit some effective estimates in principle: certainly, the above mentioned inequality from [20] was not a pure existence result. Nonetheless, in the present paper we show step by step how this estimate may be achieved. There is a hope that a better estimate will be obtained in the near future in a forthcoming joint work with G. A. Zverkina.

# 3 Proof of Theorem 1

**0**. The starting idea is to construct a Lyapunov function only for the variables $(n, x^1, \dots, x^n)$, i.e., ignoring the component $x^0$. We want to show that

$(n(X_t), X_t^0, X_t^1, \dots, X_t^n)$ with probability one hits the set $\{x : n(x) = 0\} \equiv \mathcal{S}_0$, being also positive recurrent, uniformly in the variable $x^0$. (Note that given the assumptions this is reasonable, since only $\lambda_0(\cdot)$ depends on $x^0$ essentially.) So, informally speaking, we may arrange *coupling* of two versions of the process – the original one ($X$) and the stationary one (say, $Y$) – on their joint jump from $n = 0$ to $n = 1$ (or, more precisely, from the set $\mathcal{S}_0 \times \mathcal{S}_0$ to state $(1, 0, 0, 1, 0, 0) \in \mathcal{S}_1 \times \mathcal{S}_1$). Note, however, that the existence of a stationary measure itself is yet to be shown; this will be addressed at step 6 of this proof. The proof will consist of seven major steps (this preliminary zero one not counted): the first two and the last one of which are fairly close to the calculus from [20], while the third and the fourth ones are a simple coupling on the passage of the system "from $n = 0$ to $n = 1$". For the convenience of the reader we keep most of the calculus in the steps 1–2 and 7, verifying that the more general setting here does not spoil this calculus. The constants $C, C'$, etc. in the calculus may change from line to line.

**1.** Let us show that $L_{m,a}$ may serve as a Lyapunov function. Let $\tau_0 := \inf(t \geq 0 : X_t \in \mathcal{S}_0)$, $\tau_{01} := \inf(t \geq 0 : \ X_t = (1, 0, 0)$ after visiting $\mathcal{S}_0)$. For $X_t \notin \mathcal{S}_0$, $m$ and $a$ satisfying a weakened version of the standing assumption (6)

$$C_0 > a(m + \Lambda 2^a), \tag{8}$$

and with $n = n(X_t)$ and with $M_t$ being some local martingale,

$$\begin{aligned} dL_{m,a}(X_t) &= L_{m,a}(X_{t+dt}) - L_{m,a}(X_t) \\ &\leq \lambda_n(X_t) \left( \left( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + X_t^j)^m \right)^a - \left( \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + X_t^j)^m \right)^a \right) dt \\ &- \sum_{i=1}^n h(X_t^i) \left( - \left( \sum_{1 \leq j \leq n,\, j \neq i} (1 + X_t^j)^m \right)^a + \left( \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + X_t^j)^m \right)^a \right) dt \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \left( \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + X_t^j + dt)^m \right)^a - \left( \sum_{j=1}^n (1 + X_t^j)^m \right)^a \right) + dM_t \\ &\equiv (I_1 - I_2 + I_3)dt + dM_t. \end{aligned} \tag{9}$$

Due to the assumption (4), we get,

$$I_2 \geq C_0 \sum_{i=1}^n (1 + X_t^i)^{-1} (1 + X_t^i)^m L_{m,a-1}(X_t) = C_0 L_{m-1,1}(X_t) L_{m,a-1}(X_t).$$

Hence, we can see that, at least, the "main term" $-I_2$ is negative for $X_t \notin \mathcal{S}_0$.

Our next task is to show that $I_1$ and $I_3$ are dominated by $I_2$. Then it would imply that the stationary measure integrates some polynomial. This, in turn, would allow

to extend our Lyapunov function so as to include some multiplier that depends on time (see step 2 below). The latter would provide for some $k > 0$ a crucial bound $E_x\tau_0^{k+1} < \infty$ along with its qualitative version (see the estimate (14) below). Finally, the similar inequality for $\tau_{01}$ would imply coupling between the original process and its stationary version (but not an immediate regeneration at $\tau_0$, unlike in [20]), which would mean a certain rate of convergence to the statonary regime.

We estimate (see [20]),

$$I_1 = \lambda_n(X_t) = \left(\left(1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n}(1 + X_t^j)^m\right)^a - \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n}(1 + X_t^j)^m\right)^a\right) \le \bar{\lambda}_n a 2^a L_{m,a-1}(X_t),$$

where $\bar{\lambda}_n := \sup_{x\in\mathcal{S}_n} \lambda(x)$. Due to the inequality $n \le L_{m-1,1}(X_t)$ we find,

$$I_1 \le \bar{\lambda}_n a 2^a L_{m,a-1}(X_t) \le \Lambda n\, a 2^a\, L_{m,a-1}(X_t) \le \Lambda\, a 2^a\, L_{m-1,1}(X_t) L_{m,a-1}(X_t).$$

Further, we have,

$$I_3 = am\, L_{m-1,1}(X_t) L_{m,a-1}(X_t).$$

Notice that both estimates are comparable with the estimate for $I_2$. Overall,

$$I_1 - I_2 + I_3 \le -(C_0 - \Lambda a 2^a - ma)\, L_{m-1,1}(X_t) L_{m,a-1}(X_t) < 0,$$

for $X_t \notin \mathcal{S}_0$. So, we get,

$$E_x L_{m,a}(X_{t\wedge\tau_0}) + (C_0 - a(m + \Lambda 2^a)) E_x \int_0^{t\wedge\tau_0} L_{m-1,1}(X_s) L_{m,a-1}(X_s)\, ds \le L_{m,a}(x), \quad (10)$$

and, as $t \to \infty$, under the assumption of (8), by Fatou's lemma we obtain,

$$E_x L_{m,a}(X_{\tau_0}) + (C_0 - a(m + \Lambda 2^a)) E_x \int_0^{\tau_0} L_{m-1,1}(X_s) L_{m,a-1}(X_s)\, ds \le L_{m,a}(x). \quad (11)$$

In particular, it follows that $E_x\tau_0 < \infty$ for any $x$. In the sequel we shall see that also $E_x\tau_{01} < \infty$, which does signify that the process $X$ is positive recurrent (see the details in steps 4–5 below). According to the Harris–Khasminsky principle – fully justified by steps 4 and 5 – there is an invariant measure $\mu$ (we show in the sequel that it is unique) and $L_{m-1,1}(x)L_{m,a-1}(x)$ is integrable with respect to this $\mu$. Due to the the elementary inequality (see [20])

$$L_{m,1}(x)^{(m-1)/m} \le L_{m-1,1}(x),$$

(also recall that $L_{m,a}(X_{\tau_0}) = 1$ and $L_{m,a}(x)L_{m,b}(x) = L_{m,a+b}(x)$), we obtain,

$$E_x L_{m,a}(X_{\tau_0}) + (C_0 - a(m + \Lambda)) E_x \int_0^{\tau_0} L_{m,a-1/m}(X_s)\, ds \le L_{m,a}(x).$$

In particular, for any $t$,

$$E_x L_{m,a}(X_{\tau_0}) \vee E_x L_{m,a}(X_{t\wedge\tau_0}) \le L_{m,a}(x). \tag{12}$$

**2.** Now, let $L_{m,a,k}(t,x) := (1+t)^k L_{m,a}(x),\ k<\ell$. Similarly to the above, we have,

$$dL_{m,a,k}(t,X_t) = L_{m,a,k}(t+dt, X_{t+dt}) - L_{m,a,k}(t,X_t)$$

$$\le (1+t)^k\,[I_1 - I_2 + I_3] + d\tilde{M}_t + k(1+t)^{k-1}\,L_{m,a}(X_t)\,dt$$

$$\le -(1+t)^k(C_0 - a(m+\Lambda))L_{m,a-1/m}(X_t)\,dt + k(1+t)^{k-1}\,L_{m,a}(X_t)\,dt + d\tilde{M}_t.$$

Now the task is to ensure that the negative part in the right hand side of the last expression prevails all other terms. We will be using the inequality established in the step 1 above. The second term may be split into two parts,

$$I := k(1+t)^{k-1}\,L_{m,a}(X_t)$$

$$= I\times 1(k(1+t)^{k-1}\,L_{m,a}(X_t) \le \epsilon(1+t)^k L_{m,a-1/m}(X_t))$$

$$+I\times 1(k(1+t)^{k-1}\,L_{m,a}(X_t) > \epsilon(1+t)^k L_{m,a-1/m}(X_t)).$$

The first part of this term here with '$\le \epsilon$', is dominated by the main negative expression if $\epsilon < C_0 - a(m+\Lambda 2^a)$.

Let us estimate the second part of this term. We have, for any $\ell > k$,

$$I\times 1(k(1+t)^{k-1}\,L_{m,a}(X_t) > \epsilon(1+t)^k L_{m,a-1/m}(X_t))$$

$$\le I\times \frac{(k\,L_{m,a}(X_t))^\ell}{(\epsilon(1+t)L_{m,a-1/m}(X_t))^\ell} = I\times\frac{k^\ell}{(\epsilon(1+t))^\ell}L_{m,\ell/m}(X_t).$$

Therefore, the second part of the second term does not exceed

$$k(1+t)^{k-1}\ \times\frac{k^\ell}{(\epsilon(1+t))^\ell}L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_t).$$

Denote $a' := a+\ell/m$, and, respectively, assume

$$C_0 > a'(m+\Lambda 2^{a'}). \tag{13}$$

Now, let us collect all terms and their bounds, integrate and take expectation,

$$E_x L_{m,a,k}(t\wedge\tau_0, X_{t\wedge\tau_0}) + (C - a(m+\Lambda) - \epsilon)E_x\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_0}(1+s)^k L_{m,a-1/m}(X_s)\,ds$$

$$\le L_{m,a}(x) + C'\int_0^\infty E_x 1(s\le t\wedge\tau_0)(1+s)^{k-1-\ell}L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds.$$

Here due to (12) and under the assumption (13),

$$E_x 1(s\le t\wedge\tau_0)L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\le L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x).$$

Thus,

$$\int_0^\infty E_x 1(s\le t\wedge\tau_0)(1+s)^{k-1-\ell}L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds\le CL_{m,a+\ell/m}(x),$$

where the constant $C$ clearly admits an effective estimate, as well as $C'$ a few lines earleir. Further, due to Fatou's lemma, for $k<\ell$ this implies,

$$E_x L_{m,a,k}(\tau_0, X_{\tau_0}) + C'E_x\int_0^{\tau_0}(1+s)^k L_{m,a-1/m}(X_s)\,ds\le L_{m,a}(x) + C''L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x).$$

Since $L_{m,a-1/m}(X_s)\ge 1$, we obtain

$$E_x\tau_0^{k+1}\le CL_{m,a}(x) + CL_{m,a+\ell/m}(x).$$

or, with one more new constant $C$,

$$E_x\tau_0^{k+1}\le CL_{m,a+\ell/m}(x). \tag{14}$$

Here also the constant $C$ does allow an effective estimate.

**3**. It follows straight away that under the assumptions of the Theorem,

$$E_x\tau_{01}^{k+1}\le CL_{m,a+\ell/m}(x), \tag{15}$$

and, since $L_{m,a}(x)\equiv 0$ for $x\in\mathcal{S}_0$, also

$$\sup_{t\ge 0}E_x\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_{01}}L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds\le CL_{m,a+(\ell+1)/m}(x). \tag{16}$$

**4**. **"Hitting the set $\mathcal{S}_0\times\mathcal{S}_0$"**. Similarly to (14), it may be justified *for the couple of independent processes* $(X_t)$, $(Y_t)$ with possibly different initial values that

$$E_{X_0,Y_0}\bar{\tau}_{00}^{k+1}<\infty,$$

with a bound,

$$E_{X_0,Y_0}\bar{\tau}_{00}^{k+1} \le C\left(L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0) + L_{m,a+\ell/m}(Y_0)\right), \tag{17}$$

with any $k < \ell$, where

$$\bar{\tau}_{00} := \inf(t \ge 0 : (X_t, Y_t) \in \mathcal{S}_0 \times \mathcal{S}_0).$$

The inequality (17) can be established similarly to the lines of proving (38–39) in [20]. The first step is to show that

$$E_{x_0,y_0}\bar{\tau}_{KK}^{k+1} < \infty,$$

and, more precisely,

$$E_{x_0,y_0}\bar{\tau}_{KK}^{k+1} \le C\left(L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0) + L_{m,a+\ell/m}(Y_0)\right) =: C\bar{L}_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0, Y_0), \tag{18}$$

for some appropriately chosen set $K = \{x : n(x) \le N, \max\limits_{1\le j\le n(x)} x_j \le N\}$ (i.e., with $N$ large enough), where

$$\bar{\tau}_{KK} := \inf(t \ge 0 : (X_t, Y_t) \in K \times K).$$

Recall that so far there is no restriction on the zero-components. The inequality (18) follows from a similar chain of inequalities as earlier for one component ($X$), now with a new Lyapunov function for two components

$$\bar{L}_{k,m,a}(t, X, Y) := L_{k,m,a}(t, X) + L_{k,m,a}(t, Y),$$

if the value $N$ is large enough. The reason is that for $L_{m,a}(X_t)$, say, large enough (greater than a certain $N'$), the main negative term in the right hand side of the Itô differential (9) will dominate all other possibly positive terms for another component $L_{m,a}(Y_t)$ if the latter is small enough (does not exceed some constant $N''$); otherwise – if the second term is not small – it is negative itself. Then, re-writing $L_{m,a}(X) \ge N'$ in terms of $X$ itself (i.e., as $|X| > N$), we get the required value of $N$, which guarantees (18). The details will be provided in a further publication.

The second step is to notice that from $K\times K$ the process $(X, Y)$ hits the set $\mathcal{S}_0\times\mathcal{S}_0$ with a positive probability in a unit time. With the help of a corresponding geometric like series, (17) follows (cf. the transition from (39) to (38) in [20]); note that this geometric like series does not change any parameter of the Lyapunov function but only increases the constant multiplier $C$, which still admits some effective estimate.

**5.** Let us, indeed, show (17), or, actually, some inequality equivalent ot that. The probability for the couple $(X,Y)$ to hit the set $\mathcal{S}_0\times\mathcal{S}_0$ starting from $K\times K$ in a unit of time is no less than

$$p_{K0}=\left(\frac{C_0}{(N+1)+1}\right)^2.$$

Each time when this "attempt" to hit $\mathcal{S}_0\times\mathcal{S}_0$ happens, we stop the process $(X,Y)$ after $\bar\tau_{KK}$ either at state $\mathcal{S}_0\times\mathcal{S}_0$, or at the moment $(\bar\tau_{KK}+1)\wedge\inf(s\ge\bar\tau_{KK}:\ (X,Y)\notin K'\times K')$, with $K'=\{x:\ n(x)\le N+1,\ \max\limits_{1\le j\le n(x)}x_j\le N+1\}$, whatever occurs earlier.

Denote $M:=C\sup_{(X,Y)\in K'\times K'}\bar L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X,Y)$, see (18). Then,

$$E(\bar\tau_{00}-\tau_{KK})^{k+1}$$

$$\le 1^{k+1}p_{K0}+E(1+\bar\tau_{KK})^{k+1}(1-p_{K0})p_{K0}+\ldots+n^{k+1}(1-p_{K0})^{n-1}p_{K0}+\ldots$$

$$\le\sum_{n\ge1}n^{k+1}(1-p_{K0})^{n-1}p_{K0}2^k(1+\sup_{K'\times K'}E(\bar\tau_{KK})^{k+1})$$

$$\le p_{K0}2^k(1+M)\sum_{n\ge1}n^{k+1}(1-p_{K0})^{n-1}=:M_2.$$

Now,

$$E\bar\tau_{00}^{k+1}=E((\bar\tau_{00}-\bar\tau_{KK})+\bar\tau_{KK})^{k+1}\le2^k(E(\bar\tau_{00}-\bar\tau_{KK})^{k+1}+E\bar\tau_{KK}^{k+1})$$

$$\le2^k(C\bar L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0,Y_0)+M_2).$$

This is the desired inequality equivalent to (17).

**6. Coupling at the "$\mathcal{S}_0\mapsto\mathcal{S}_1$" passage.** Further, from state $(0,*,0,*)\in\mathcal{S}_0\times\mathcal{S}_0$, coupling is achieved with a positive (bounded away from zero) probability over a unit time interval on the passage to state $(1,0,0,1,0,0)\in\mathcal{S}_1\times\mathcal{S}_1$ due to the assumption

$$0<\underline{\lambda}_0:=\inf_x\lambda_0(x)\le\sup_x\lambda_0(x)=\bar\lambda_0<\infty.$$

Indeed, denote $\underline{\lambda}_0:=\inf_x\lambda_0(x)$ and

$$\bar\tau_{01}:=\inf(t\ge0:\ (X_t,Y_t)=(1,0,0,1,0,0)\text{ after visiting }(0,*,0,*)).$$

The moment $\bar\tau_{01}$ may be regarded as a moment of coupling, i.e., the moment of meeting of the two versions of the process, after which due to the strong Markov

property the processes may be considered as equal, of course, after a corresponding change of the probability space. (Clearly, without such a change the moment $\tau_{01}$ may never occur, i.e., it may be equal infinity.) Indeed, after such a change, we may assume that each of the two processes performs jumps up from state $(0,*)$ according to two *independent* flows of "events", one due to the intensity $\underline{\lambda}_0$ and the other due to the "remainder" flow with intensity $\lambda_0(\cdot) - \underline{\lambda}_0$. The point is that the flow with intensity $\underline{\lambda}_0$ may be regarded as *the same* for the two processes and, hence, on this new probability space both processes (more precisely, their equivalents) jump up to state $(1,0,0)$ simultaneously with probability at least $p_{01} := (1 - \exp(-\underline{\lambda}_0)) \times \exp(-2(\bar{\lambda}_0 - \underline{\lambda}_0))$ on a unit interval of time.

So, it remains to show that under this change of probability space, the moment $\bar{\tau}_{01}$ satisfies the bound,

$$E_{X_0,Y_0}\bar{\tau}_{01}^{k+1} < \infty, \tag{19}$$

and, moreover, for $X_0 = (n^1, x)$, $Y_0 = (n^2, y)$ and for $k < \ell$ that

$$E_{X_0,Y_0}\bar{\tau}_{01}^{k+1} \le C\bar{L}_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0, Y_0), \tag{20}$$

with a new $C > 0$. The crucial bound (20) here is due to (17) and to the fact that coupling on the passage from "$\mathcal{S}_0 \mapsto \mathcal{S}_1$" occurs with a positive probability over a unit time (see above), with the help of one more geometric like series. Denote this moment of coupling by $T := \inf(t \ge 0 : X_t = Y_t, (X_t, Y_t) = (1,0,0,1,0,0))$ (the change of probability space is assumed as prescribed earleir). From (20) it clearly follows that

$$E_{x,y}T^{k+1} \le C\bar{L}_{m,a+\ell/m}(x, y), \tag{21}$$

since $T \le \bar{\tau}_{01}$.

**7.** Hence, let us show the details of how to derive the inequality (20). Assuming that both components are in state $n(X) = n(Y) = 0$, with probability at least $p_{01}$ there will be a "successful coupling" during a unit of time. In any case, we stop the process $(X, Y)$ after $\bar{\tau}_{00}$ either at state $(1,0,0,1,0,0,)$, or at the moment $(\bar{\tau}_{00} + 1) \wedge \inf(s \ge \bar{\tau}_{00} : (X, Y) \notin \mathcal{S}_0 \times \mathcal{S}_0)$, whatever occurs earlier.

Denote $M_3 := C \sup_{(X,Y)=(1,0,0,0,*,*)} \bar{L}_{m,a+\ell/m}(X, Y)$ (with two arbitrary but equal values $* = *$). Then,

$$E(\bar{\tau}_{01} - \tau_{00})^{k+1}$$

$$\le 1^{k+1}p_{01} + E(1 + \bar{\tau}_{00})^{k+1}(1 - p_{01})p_{01} + \ldots + n^{k+1}(1 - p_{01})^{n-1}p_{01} + \ldots$$

$$\le \sum_{n\ge 1} n^{k+1}(1 - p_{01})^{n-1}p_{01}2^k(1 + \sup_{(X,Y)=(1,0,0,0,*,*)} E(\bar{\tau}_{00})^{k+1})$$

$$\le p_{01}2^k(1+M_3)\sum_{n\ge 1} n^{k+1}(1-p_{01})^{n-1} =: M_4.$$

Now,

$$E\bar\tau_{01}^{k+1} = E((\bar\tau_{01}-\bar\tau_{00})+\bar\tau_{00})^{k+1} \le 2^k(E(\bar\tau_{01}-\bar\tau_{00})^{k+1} + E\bar\tau_{00}^{k+1})$$

$$\le 2^k[2^k(C\bar L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0,Y_0)+M_2)+M_4].$$

This is the desired inequality equivalent to (20).

**8.** The existence of invariant measure $\mu$ follows from the fact that $(1,0,0)$ is a regeneration state and from (19) (suffices even for one component), by the formula

$$\mu(A) = cE_{(1,0,0)}\int_0^{\tau_{01}} 1(X_t\in A)\,dt), \tag{22}$$

with

$$\tau_{01} := \inf(t\ge 0:\ (X_t) = (1,0,0) \text{ after visiting } (0,*)),$$

due to the Harris–Khasminsky approach. Here $c$ is the normalising constant.

For the sequel notice that by virtue of (22) and (16),

$$\int L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x)\,\mu(dx) < \infty, \tag{23}$$

however, for our aims the value of this integral also has to be estimated.

First of all, notice that $L_{m,\,a}(X)\equiv 0$ for $X\in\mathcal{S}_0$, so that

$$\sup_{t\le 0} E_X\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_{01}} L_{m,\,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds \equiv$$

$$\equiv \sup_{t\ge 0}\left(E_X\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_0} L_{m,\,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds + E_X\int_{t\wedge\tau_0}^{t\wedge\tau_{01}} L_{m,\,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds\right) =$$

$$= \sup_{t\ge 0} E_X\int_0^{t\wedge\tau_0} L_{m,\,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds,$$

because the first term in the second line here is equal to zero. Further, by (22) (and with $c$ from (22)), we have,

$$\int L_{m,\,a+\ell/m}(X)\,\mu(dX) = c\,E_{(1,\,0,\,0)}\int_0^{\tau_{01}} L_{m,\,a+\ell/m}(X_s)\,ds$$

$$\le c\,\frac{1}{C_0 - a'(m+\Lambda)}\,L_{m,\,a+(\ell+1)/m}(1,\,0,\,0) = \frac{c}{C_0-a'(m+\Lambda)},\quad a' = a+\ell/m.$$

So, in order to have an upper bound for the integral in (23), it remains to estimate the constant $c$ from above. From (22) with $A = \Omega$ we get,

$$c = \frac{1}{E_{(1,0,0)}\tau_{01}} \le \frac{1}{E_{(1,0,0)}\tau_0 + E_{(0,0)}\tau_{01}} \le \frac{1}{\frac{1}{\Lambda} + \frac{1}{C_0+1}} = \frac{\Lambda(C_0+1)}{\Lambda + C_0 + 1}.$$

Therefore, we obtain the following bound for the value of the integral in (23):

$$\int_{\mathcal{S}} L_{m,\, a+\ell/m}(X)\, \mu(dX) = c\, E_{(1,0,0)} \int_0^{\tau_{01}} L_{m,\, a+\ell/m}(X_s)\, ds \le \tag{24}$$

$$\le \frac{\Lambda(C_0+1)}{(\Lambda + C_0 + 1)(C_0 - (a+\ell/m)(m+\Lambda))} =: C_1.$$

Returning now to (20), we can see that it follows by integration that for the distribution $\mu$ (and with a new constant $C$),

$$E_{X_0,\mu} T^{k+1} \le C L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0), \tag{25}$$

under the standing assumption (6) of the Theorem. Indeed, by virtue of (21),

$$E_{x,\mu} T^{k+1} = \int E_{X_0,y} T^{k+1} \mu(dy) \le C \int \bar{L}_{m,a+\ell/m}(x,y) \mu(dy)$$

$$= C L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x) + C \int L_{m,a+\ell/m}(y) \mu(dy)$$

$$\le C L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x) + C_1 \le (C + C_1) L_{m,a+\ell/m}(x)$$

(for example), where both constant are effectively estimated.

**9.** A possible completion of the proof is quite standard. Consider two independent versions $X$ and $Y$ of our Markov process, one starting at $X_0$ and another at the stationary distribution $\mu$ found earlier. Now, on the changed probability space as described,

$$|(\mu_t^{X_0} - \mu)(A)| \le |E_{X_0,\mu}(1(X_t \in A) - 1(Y_t \in A))|\, 1(t \ge T)$$

$$+ |E_{X_0,\mu}(1(X_t \in A) - 1(Y_t \in A))|\, 1(t < T)$$

$$\le E_{X_0,\mu} 1(t < T) = P_{X_0,\mu}(t < T) \le \frac{E_{X_0,\mu} T^{k+1}}{t^{k+1}} \le \frac{(C + C_1) L_{m,a+\ell/m}(X_0)}{t^{k+1}}\,.$$

This shows the main statement of the Theorem since $\|\mu_t^{X_0} - \mu\|_{TV} = 2 \sup_A (\mu_t^{X_0} - \mu)(A)$; the version of the denominator $(1+t)^{k+1}$ clearly can be used instead of $t^{k+1}$ since the left hand side may never exceed one. Uniqueness of a stationary distribution $\mu$ also automatically follows from this convergence. The Theorem 1 is proved.

# References


[1] Asmussen, S.: Applied Probability and Queues. Chichester et al., John Wiley and Sons, 1987.

[2] Borovkov, A. A.: Stochastic processes in queueing theory, Berlin, Springer, 1976.

[3] Gnedenko, B. V., Kovalenko, I. N.: Introduction to queueing theory. Boston, Birkhauser, 1989.

[4] Davis, M. H. A.: Piecewise–Deterministic Markov Processes: A General Class of Non–Diffusion Stochastic Models // J. Royal Stat. Soc. Ser. B (Methodological), 1984, 46(3), 353–388.

[5] Erlang, A. K.: Solution of some Problems in the Theory of Probabilities of Significance in Automatic Telephone Exchanges // Elektrotkeknikeren, 1917, 13, 5–13.

[6] Fortet, R.: Calcul des probabilités. CNRS, 1950.

[7] Kalashnikov, V. V.: The property of $\gamma$–reflexivity for Markov sequences. Sov. Math., Dokl. 1973, 14, 1869–1873.

[8] Kalashnikov, V. V.: Analysis of stability in queuing theory by a trial functions method // Theory of Probability and its Applications, 1977, 22(1), 86–103.

[9] Karlin, S., Taylor, H. M.: A First Course in Stochastic Processes. San Diego et al., 2nd Ed., Academic Press, An imprint of Elsevier, San Diego, 1975.

[10] Kelbert, M., Veretennikov, A.: On the estimation of mixing coefficients for a multiphase service system // Queueing Systems, 1997, 25, 325–337.

[11] König, D., Matthes, K., Nawrotzki, K.: Verallgemeinerung der Erlangschen und Engsetschen Formeln. (Eine Methode in der Bedienungstheorie). Berlin, Akademie Verlag, 1967.

[12] Matthes, K.: Zür Theorie der Bedienungsprozesse // Trans. 3rd Prague Conf. on Information Theory, Statistical Decision Functions, Random Processes, Publ. House of the Czechoslovak Acad. of Sci., Liblice, Czechoslovakia, 1962, 513–528.

[13] Menshikov, M. V., Popov, S. Yu., Exact Power Estimates For Countable Markov Chains // Markov Processes Relat. Fields 1995, 1, 57–78.

[14] Sevastyanov, B. A.: An Ergodic Theorem for Markov Processes and Its Application to Telephone Systems with Refusals // Theory Probab. Appl. 1957, 2(1), 104–112.

[15] Sevastyanov, B. A.: Erlang formulae in telephone systems with arbitrary distribution function of call // Proc. III–rd All–Union Mathematical Congress, Moscow, June–July 1956, vol. 4, Acad. Sci. USSR Publ. House, 1959, 121–135 (in Russian).

[16] Schassberger, R.: Insensitivity of Steady–State Distributions of Generalized Semi–Markov Processes, I. // Ann. Probab. 1977, 5(1), 87–99; II. // ibid., 1978, 6(1), 85–93.

[17] Thorisson, H.: Coupling, Stationarity, and Regeneration. New York, Springer, 2000.

[18] Veretennikov, A. Yu.: The ergodicity of service systems with an infinite number of servomechanisms // Math. Notes, 1977, 22(4), 804–808.

[19] Veretennikov, A. Yu.: On the rate of convergence to the stationary distribution in the single–server queuing systems // Automation and Remote Control, 2013, 74(10), 1620–1629.

[20] Veretennikov, A. Yu.: On the rate of convergence for infinite server Erlang–Sevastyanovs problem // Queueing Systems, 2014, 76(2), 181–203.

[21] Veretennikov, A. Yu., Zverkina, G. A.: Simple Proof of Dynkin's Formula for Single–Server Systems and Polynomial Convergence Rates // Markov Processes and Related Fields, 2014, 20(3), 479–504.